

**Policy Implications for the Action Agenda from the Puget Sound Science Update**  
**Sample Guiding Questions**  
**July 8, 2010**

*The following are examples of questions that would be posed to the Science Panel as a guide for distilling the policy implications of the Puget Sound Science Update. The answers to these questions would be drawn from the Update chapters and the synthesis document.*

**In re: Threats**

*Based on the information captured in the Science Update...*

1. Has the current or future importance of specific threats, as reflected by the Action Agenda priorities, changed? If so, how?
2. Has the urgency (e.g., immediate need for restorative actions or increased funding) to address specific threats changed, even if their relative importance has not? If so, how?
3. Are there new threats that need to be accounted for in Action Agenda priorities and implementation efforts?
4. Are the Action Agenda priorities and implementation efforts collectively effectively focusing on the most important threats?
5. Can we better estimate the level of effort necessary to effectively address a threat?

**In re: Goal/Target Setting**

*Based on the information captured in the Science Update...*

1. What are the implications of current science for setting of targets/ benchmarks for any indicator?
2. Are there any ecosystem indicator thresholds that would suggest changes to ecosystem states that need to be avoided or managed to recover Puget Sound? If so, what are they and how should they be reflected in the Action Agenda?
3. What are effective ways to engage scientists, policy-makers and the public in setting goals/targets?

**In re: Strategies**

*Based on the information captured in the Science Update...*

1. Are any current strategies to abate specific threats clearly inadequate, i.e., will not improve ecosystem outcomes?
2. Can current strategies be improved or made more efficient (e.g., address multiple threats)?

3. Which strategies for recovery may be more feasible given the social science understanding of public acceptance of different recovery strategies?

**In re: Information Needs**

*Based on the information captured in the Science Update...*

1. In what areas does the lack of natural scientific information most constrain the understanding of risks and uncertainties driving affecting policy decisions?
2. In what areas does the lack of social scientific information most constrain the understanding of risks and uncertainties driving affecting policy decisions?
3. What areas of scientific uncertainty are the most important to address to guide future adaptation and implementation of Action Agenda strategies?
4. The PSSU is organized around these chapters 1) ecosystem indicators, 2) current conditions, 3) threats, and 4) strategies. Could this be reorganized to better inform decisions guiding recovery? If so, how?
5. Which chapters and elements within chapters should the science community focus on for the next PSSU, as a means of improving our strategic approach to Puget Sound recovery?